RESTORATION REVIEW

Leroy Garrett, Editor

October, 1977 Vol. 19, No. 8

Our 25th Anniversary

Bible Talk – 1952 to 1958
Restoration Review – 1959 to 1977

Volume 19, No. 8 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **October 1977**

Principles of Unity and Fellowship . . .

RECEIVING A BROTHER BECAUSE HE IS A BROTHER
(Or A Sister Because She Is A Sister)

Receive one another, therefore, even as Christ has received you, for the glory of God. —Rom. 15:17

Now tell me, with the scriptures in hand, is there any basis for our receiving one another in Christ, except that we are brothers and sisters? I am not to receive you because of your age, sex, cultural background, or political persuasion. Nor on the basis of how much you agree with me on this or that interpretation of scripture. Nor on the basis of whether you are right or wrong on this or that point of doctrine or practice.

If acceptance depended on our agreements, then our fellowship would be very tenuous indeed, about as shaky as jello. If either of us changed our mind, without the other changing hers, our fellowship would *ipso facto* end just like that. *Ipso facto* means "by that very fact" and it is appropriate to this problem, for our hangup is that we can't enjoy fellowship *by the very fact* of our disagreements. To put it another way: one must be *faithful* to be received, but we make *faithful* mean a conformity to our way of seeing things, not loyalty or dedication to Jesus as Lord. If a sister now supposes that she can speak in tongues, or *does* speak in tongues, she can no longer be received. If a brother believes he has the gift of healing and begins to pray for the sick as never before, well, too bad for him in some circles, for he is barred from the fellowship of the saints even if he is out healing the sick.

Or it's someone's position on the millennium. Or it's societies or agencies. Or instrumental music. Or something.

Could this possibly be what Jesus came to bring us when he came to make us sisters and brothers? It is not possible, for the Jews already had that kind of religion in the legalism of the Pharisees. They watched Jesus to see if he violated some infraction of their law, not to see whether he led men and women closer to God.

Jesus makes us brothers, not on the ground of our conformity to a doctrinal standard, however sound that standard may be, but on the basis of our relationship to God. Wherever God has a daughter, I have a sister, and I am to accept her for *that* reason.

The other evening Ouida was gabbing with one of our dear sisters following our assembly here in Denton. I stepped into the picture long enough to assure her that I too loved her, and then added, "When a man can say that to a woman with his wife sitting beside her it must be for real." She

responded with something like "Oh, it's for real, all right," appreciating the affection that we both have for her. Widowhood has not been easy for her, and she likes to tell us how much she and her husband loved each other.

Sister! Brother! Those relationships should be deep and meaningful, but they are vacuous and vaporous if they rely on doctrinal agreement. Ouida and I love and accept this woman because she is our sister in the Lord, not because she agrees with us, which she probably doesn't. Insofar as fellowship is concerned her agreements or disagreements with our points of view are completely beside the point. True, disagreements may in some circumstances place a strain on the fellowship, and that is why we are urged to love and forebear, so as to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But agreement can never be the basis of the acceptance, for then fellowship would be grounded in intellectual attainment rather than a loving relationship.

William Barclay tells the story of a veteran French soldier, known for his valor, saying to a recent recruit who was shaking in his boots with fear in the face of the enemy, "Come with me, and we'll do something fine for France." Their love for country was their common bond, and only that could transcend their differences in age, experience, ability, and knowledge.

If we have to wait for a sister to catch up with us before we can put an arm around her and say, "Come with us, we'll do something fine for Christ and the church," then we only have a party, not the Body of Christ. The brother who is wrong needs us even more than the one who is right, and we are to receive him in spite of his errors, because he is a brother. This does not mean that doctrinal errors are unimportant, but it does mean that they are to be worked out *within* the fellowship. If he is God's son, then he is family, and we are to work on our problems *as a family.*

What saith the scriptures? Rom. 15:7 states the basis upon which we are to receive one another: *as Christ has received you.* It doesn't require much self-examination for us to realize that Jesus did not receive us because we were right or because we were associated with the correct party. It was "while we were yet sinners" and with all sorts of hangups, and rather steeped in ignorance, that Jesus reached out to us. This is the ground upon which we are to receive each other. There can be no other. If we have to give each other some kind of loyalty test before we can receive each other, then brotherhood has no meaning. I am to love and accept you because you are my brother. If it is for any other reason, it is *that* that is deemed really important and not brotherhood itself. If you take me in because I happen to be *right* like you, I have no assurance that brotherhood will continue even if it has begun. I want to be loved for what I am, God's child and your brother, and not because I belong to the party.

Notice the *therefore* in Rom. 15:7: "Receive one another, therefore, as Christ has received you." That word takes us back to all those principles of unity and brotherhood set forth in chapter 14:1 through 15:6. The first paragraph of chap. 14 shows that sisters and brothers will differ: "one believes one way and another believes another way" is what he is saying. Verse 1 tells us to receive "the man

who is weak in the faith" (that is, the one who has a problem with the differences) but not for the purpose of arguing with him. Never mind about disputing with him, but *receive* him, the apostle is saying. Why? Because he is your brother. There can be no sounder reason.

There is also the principle of "the servant of another," and it alone will free us from our judgmental attitudes. Verse 4 lays it on us: "Who are you to pass judgment on the servant of another." You may be my brother but you are not my servant, and so I don't have to give an account for you. And, so, I don't need to judge you as if I did! It is before your own master that you stand or fall. So, what am I to do? Receive you! Isn't it beautiful? I don't have to worry about judging you, or evaluating your sincerity, for your master is going to do that.

He goes on to talk about the principle of peace and edification: "Let us then pursue what makes for peace and mutual upbuilding" (verse 19). He tells us that we no longer "walk in love" if we allow our insensitivity to injure a brother (verse 15). We are to do what pleases our brother, not ourselves, and thus edify him (15:3). We are to live in harmony with each other so as to glorify God *together (15:5-6).*

Then conies the *therefore.* In view of all these principles of brotherhood, we are to receive each other as Christ has received us. It is a great lesson, and as with all great lessons we are all too slow to learn it and make proper application.

While at Bethany this past summer for a conference I spent some time with a dear brother, a professor in the college, who had lost his beautiful wife only last year. In the trauma of her passing he was shown compassion by a Church of Christ up North where she was hospitalized, though they are Disciples of Christ. He was touched by their kindness and tenderness, calling on her and praying with her, and loving them both. When this brother stepped into a circle of Church of Christ scholars from down South, he continued to enjoy this acceptance. But when a historian from Alabama explained that in his churches he would not even be called on to lead a prayer, much less to speak, he was visibly saddened.

Like all of us, he needs and wants to be accepted, simply as a brother. And has the *right,* under God, as His child, to be loved and welcomed by all of God's family. We sin when we do not welcome him. God never intended that we accept each other on the basis of seeing everything alike. God pity us when our view of brotherhood is that warped.

When I see Jesus in you, how can I help but love and welcome you? If I love Jesus, whom I have not seen, I will love those who bear his likeness that I do see. We are to love and welcome each other for what we are, and be hanged with all the hangups!

As I finished this article, I had a call from Dalton Porter of Mabank, Texas, who ministers to Beacon Church of Christ in Gun Barrel, one of our freer churches. He told me of this brother of "Non-cooperative" persuasions who is having difficulty being accepted by the churches in that area. They

want him to change his convictions and believe like they believe. Dalton told him, "We'll welcome you just as you are." That's it! —*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

WE'RE 25 YEARS OLD!

In the history of our Movement we've had literally thousands of journals sent forth from the press. Printer's ink has flowed in the veins of our leaders, as the historians like to put it. Most of these papers survived only a few years and many of them only a few issues. Only a very few indeed have prevailed for a quarter of a century, and fewer still have gone that long with the same editor. While there is no particular virtue in mere survival, we pause after these 25 years to thank God that He has given us the strength and the wherewithal to hang in for so long.

It is probable that most of our readers have never even seen a copy of old *Bible Talk,* which is what we were called for the first six years, beginning in October, 1952. Artist Tom Farr, a brother in our congregation here in Denton, has come up with a creation that will give you an idea what we first looked like. The first issue was soon in short supply, and all the 64 issues of *Bible Talk* have long since been unattainable, though we continue to get requests for them. We published all 12 months for the first two years, reserving the July and August issues for evangelistic purposes. In October 1954 we went on a schedule of ten issues a year, skipping July and August, which has been our plan ever since, except that the first five years of *Restoration Review* were issued on a quarterly basis.

Our very first paragraph to be presented to the public was a statement of purpose:

> **Simply stated, our purpose in this paper is to do all the good we can and no harm at all. We may not succeed in such a purpose but we shall try. The mission of this new paper is primarily to the church. We feel that the church faces grave dangers, and these dangers must be faced if the church is to triumph. "Bible Talk" does not pose as a reformer of the church. Neither does it claim to know all the answers or to be a panacea for all our ills. It only wants to help in some small way in the battle that is obviously before us. It has something to say and its only request is that it might be given a fair hearing.**

This gives you some idea what we look like. From our house to yours, with love. — *Ouida and Leroy*

In that editorial I identified some of the problems. "The church needs more personal study and more private prayer. It needs more piety and consecration," I observed, and I further made it clear that I was going to fight our entrenched pastor system: "That we have a pastor system is generally conceded even by the more liberal element. The college president to whom we have referred said in his lecture about our dangers; 'There is a tendency toward the pastor system.' And in repeating that speech on one occasion he left his manuscript to add: 'And I apologize for the word *tenden*cy!' This paper will not shun a full treatment of all such subjects, whether they he tendencies or actualities." I zeroed in on what I conceived to be the real culprits: "We feel that institutionalism and professionalism are teammates in that inauspicious game of apostasy into which they have together enticed the church. The bride of Christ is being escorted into religious prostitution with professionals on one arm and institutions on the other."

But there is one statement in that first editorial that I would now say differently: "Mankind has had the gospel for two thousand years and yet today less than one-tenth of one percent of the human race is in the church of Christ." While the light had begun to break even then, I was still something of an exclusivist about the Church of Christ.

Well, as the months and years slipped by we were accused of writing on nothing except the pastor system, which was hardly the case. As I look back on those years I think some of my very best writing, on many different themes, were in those early volumes. Some of it was written at Harvard, while I was finishing my Ph.D. in the history and philosophy of religion, so I had the stimulation of that very unique environment. I met one student there, a mature woman, who had fled from behind the Iron Curtain. We told her story, without revealing her name for her own protection, in two installments, the kind of material that might have appeared in something like *Readers' Digest.*

My "Letters from Harvard" dealt with my experience of dining at the Graduate School with students from all over the world, or about my visit to a Quaker meeting in Cambridge, or about my visit with an Episcopal priest (also a Ph.D. candidate) at his humble abode where he lived on $5.00 a

week, or about my preaching at Boston Common where I immersed a man into Christ one wintry evening. I spent five months away from home at Harvard in 1956, writing my thesis. Ouida and our newly-adopted Phoebe were in Dallas. So the paper for that year reflects that experience, including a siege in the Harvard infirmary, where doctors were never able to diagnose the severe pains that wracked my back, which I had never had before or have had since. When I told one of Harvard's top surgeons that a friend had written that perhaps I was too anxious about getting my work done and was suffering "anticipatory anxiety," he asked me to repeat that term. He playfully rejoined, repeating that weighty term, "Maybe that's it!"

I finally got tired of the infirmary and asked my doctor to let me out, pain or no pain. I went back to the library, to the one spot that I hallowed with hundreds of hours of hard work, and wrote my thesis, holding my left shoulder with my right hand and writing with my left hand—which is the hand I write with anyhow! I conned the janitor of the library into letting me in when he came to work, long before the library opened, and the student workers would allow me to stay on after they closed the doors late at night. After months of that I earned the reputation from my major professor for being "the most industrious student" he had ever seen. It was my industry that impressed him more than my intelligence! What he didn't know was that I was No. 2 and was therefore trying harder. I was out to prove that a high school dropout could take a Ph.D. from Harvard, and I am probably the only one who ever did. Too, Ouida was back home, so I was in a hurry.

I was determined to finish my thesis that spring, so I presumptuously filed a request for the Ph.D. for Commencement that year. Prof. Amos Wilder, both sympathetic and amazed, rebuked me with "You can't do that. No one has ever done a thesis that quickly." I was adamant. As they became more demanding, I worked all the harder. They would turn my chapters back to me with all sorts of suggestions for further research, and I would turn them back to them with all that they asked for and more. I hired an expert linguist to help me with difficult theological French and German passages, and called on him at all hours of the day and night. The deadline came and I didn't make it, to no one's surprise except my own. I went home to Ouida and Phoebe. I went back to Harvard the next year for several more weeks and finished. But I didn't wait around for Commencement, which is one of the most impressive displays of academic pomp in the world. The postman delivered my Ph.D. to me at my front door back in Dallas later that year. Ouida and I laughed about how ingloriously I had received the top degree from one of the world's greatest universities. It was something like getting the utility bill! But, my inferiority complex being what it was or is, it did me a lot of good, even if it did come to me through the screen door.

Anyway, those were *Bible Talk* years, for along with my thesis I edited the paper. By 1955 I had begun to write on "The Sin of Exclusiveness," in which I said: "We are not to consign all the people to hell who are not identified with us. Neither are we to conclude that there are no Christians in other

religious bodies. All who obey the Lord's word belong to the church of Jesus Christ. There may be many who are 'not far from the kingdom of God' who need our encouragement more than our censure. Let us not forget that God does have people in Babylon, and they are *his* people (Rev. 18:4)." In those days I ran a number of series of studies in church history, growing out of my Harvard studies, such as the early Christians and war and Judaism in the time of Christ.

My favorite article from those early years, if not of my entire editorial career, was the one I did on "Harvard University and Freed-Hardeman College: A Study in Contrasts," in which I said: "Harvard can be moral without being Christian, but FHC cannot be Christian without being moral." I laid bare some facts about both institutions. While blacks were not allowed when I studied at FHC, I learned to study with them at Harvard. I wrote: "When it takes the nation's courts to lead FHC to do what its own recognized principles could not inspire it to do, then its influence is basically immoral."

While I was at Harvard it came under severe attack from "the right" for its liberalism in general and its "harboring of Communists" in particular. Rockefeller had given the university a million dollars and some fellow in the midwest charged that it was a waste of money, and he issued a long document discrediting Harvard on several counts. What was impressive about all this was that I read all these charges on the Harvard bulletin board in the Yard. The officials were quite open to any charges anyone wished to make, and they had no qualms about passing them along for the students to read and to decide for themselves. That's freedom!

In drawing a contrast with this kind of openness, I told how FHC cringes in the face of criticism, as most of our colleges are inclined to do, and squelches any dissident voice, if it can, even to the point of putting its own people in jail. I spoke with authority on that score, for I was the one they put in jail! That episode, which I described in detail in the Feb., 1955 issue of *Bible Talk*, proved to be one of the most explosive incidents in our entire history as a people. Virtually every paper among us had something to say about it. Only Ketcherside's *Mission Messenger*, in its lead article, *Leroy Garrett Jailed!*, took issue with what FHC had done, though Jimmy Lovell's paper in California described it as "the most shameful event" in our recent history. The *Guardian* wrote on "The Ins and Outs of Leroy Garrett" and the *Gospel Advocate* had several articles designed to patch up what FHC had done, including the charge that "We cannot believe he is a normal man." They had one article signed by 26 preachers, exonerating the FHC authorities for throwing me in the cooler for the night.

In the meantime I was weighing the question in my editorials a: to whether I should sue FHC for false arrest, armed as I was with their dismissal of the charge of disturbing the peace. I challenged them to make it clear as to whether they were really *a private* institution, as they claimed, in which case I would sue them and take over a dormitory for damages, if need be; or whether they were actually *a church* institution, as I claimed, in which case I wouldn't sue them since I didn't believe in suing the church!

In those days I was the most controversial figure among us, and I was *the* issue in several of the papers. I made front page copy in the *Gospel Advocate* for weeks on end. You can see that with all my popularity these days I have wonderfully improved my standing!

It was just as well that I had long since decided that I could never expect to be supported financially by our people, nor did I want to be in that situation. Before Harvard days I taught in high schools. My Harvard degree was my union card into the world of academe. I started teaching in college in 1957 and have continued in that work since that time, though in recent years it has been only on part-time basis, other business interests making this possible. After all, the very first cover of *Bible Talks* had these words from Alexander Campbell: "It is a rarity, seldom to be witnessed, to see a person boldly opposing either the doctrinal errors or the unscriptural measures of a people with whom he has identified himself, and to whom he looks for approbation and support. If such a person appears in any party, he soon falls under the frowns of those who either think themselves wiser than the approver, or would wish so to appear." So Campbell had sufficiently warned me!

But *the* issue of *Bible Talk* was the one-man hired minister system, which I turned every way but loose. Surely in all our history, except perhaps with Campbell himself, has the clergy system within any one party received such a persistent and devastating attack as it did in *Bible Talk.* I defined it, exposed it, answered questions about it, gave examples of it, debated it—the works. I even hired an artist to caricature it! I spent much time on the scriptural function of elders and the work of the evangelist, showing that "the minister" is doing what the elders and others should be doing. I called upon our pioneers, as well as the Bible, to show that it was never intended that we have such a system.

The older preachers, a lot of them, still haven't forgiven me for those thunderous years. Nor have I asked them to! If anything, I believe now what I wrote then even more than I did then. My methods may have changed some, and certainly I have learned to be more loving and forbearing in the face of problems that have long been with us. Especially have I come to see that all such issues must be dealt with *within* a loving fellowship and not in a spirit of agitation. But as I look hack over those years I see that I *was,* for the most part, reasonable, moderate and loving. But I did press the issue. I would not let up. And, believe me, there is no way, but *no* way, to fight clericalism in the church and not come upon hard times.

It is interesting the difference that the years make. In more recent years I've had even some of the older preachers to tell me how right I was in my fight against the system back in *Bible Talk* days. I'm always tempted to say that I could surely have used their help *then!* And many of the younger preachers confide in me their desire to free themselves of the clerical trap. I advise such ones to be multi-disciplined men who are able to support themselves apart from the church treasury, if need by. More and more of our men are doing this. More important, we have a growing number of free churches that make it possible for preachers to work with them without having to practice the system.

Our own congregation here in Denton is an example of what I mean. It does precisely what I pled for year after year in *Bible Talk—a* free, spiritual, sharing ministry in which all who have the gift of teaching and exhorting can do so, led by their elders who also minister to the congregation, and if the church chooses to employ a man (or woman!), let it be under such circumstances that do not circumvent the scriptural norm: "As each has received a gift, employ it for one another, as good stewards of God's varied grace" (1 Pet. 4:10).

The Lord has really surprised me on this score—far more than I could "ask or think." Here is this free congregation right here in Denton, made up of people who never heard of *Bible Talk,* practicing what I labored so hard for many years ago. And it is happening all around. It is when churches become free that makes the difference. When they become free, they dump the system, more or less. The system is not only a one-man domination of the pulpit, but the arrogant and brutal tactics of sectarianism and exclusiveness that make impossible a free and loving fellowship of all believers.

So, since *Bible Talk* days I have come to see our problems in broader perspective. The culprit is carnality in all its varied forms. The antidote is freedom in Christ—the freedom to unite with all God's people, to love, to question, to minister, to be a little different, to be the functioning Body of Christ. No clerical system, no system of obscurantism and partyism, can survive in the face of such freedom.

This remains our task. We called ourselves *Restoration Review* starting in 1959. This is our 158th issue since the change of name. Our operation is really sort of low key. The paper stays alive and in reasonable health--I was intending to tell you why, but I really don't know, unless it is that we look to the Lord to bless it as our ministry toward a more loving, spiritual and responsible church. We are enjoying being a part of the great victory that has come to us all thus far. The future? I am sure that our labor will not be in vain. How much longer will we publish? It would he inappropriate to have any other view than "One issue at a time, dear Savior."

I am using *our* and *we so* as to include Ouida and not simply as the editorial plural. She has yet to write her first article and has no plans of getting around to it, which means that her mistakes in these columns all these years have been far fewer than my own. But I've read hundreds of articles to her across the kitchen table—and it *would* make interesting reading if you had access to what she persuaded me to delete. For good or ill, I do not *always* listen to her, but I do more than I don't. I sometimes insist, "If I expect to really change people's thinking, I have to lay it out there like it is." But who really knows what to write and how to write to the modern church with its many sticky problems? These days I find myself praying more about each article that I am about to compose, and I don't think I've always done that. I often feel very inadequate for the task. Who really knows how to be an editor?

But one thing I know and that is the worth of Ouida by my side. She is my crown and joy. We are fellow laborers in the Lord for your sake. We hope to arrange for a picture for this our 25th Anniversary Issue, so that you can see what we look like in our element. This is our way of sending special greetings to you all. — *the Ed.*

THE CHURCH OF TOMORROW

The church of tomorrow will be much less denominational. While it may keep the denomination as a method of getting work done, it will transcend utterly the notion of any denominational self-sufficiency.

The church of tomorrow will he one in which the local church is a small theological seminary. It will be a place where what we have called laymen will learn and study and prepare for their witness in the world. The week days will be more important than Sundays. — *Elton Trueblood*

Let a man discover what he is characteristically touchy about and he will gain valuable insight into his personal problem. — *Harry Emerson Fosdick*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

ARE WE A DENOMINATION?

A recent full-page ad on books in the *Gospel Guardian* appears innocent enough. It is a list of 25 or 30 commentaries, arranged under two headings, one by "Denominational Authors" and the other "Written by Brethren." This is, of course, common practice among our folk, but I happen to believe that we should now and again call into question that which is common—if not unclean!

This business of the other guys being "the denominations" and we "the true church"—or *the* brethren—is but one more expression of our cruel exclusivism. We are sectarians when we carve ourselves out of the Body of Christ at large and claim to be the sum total of that Body. We may not intend it, but we leave the impression upon our neighbors of being self-righteous and haughty, for we see ourselves as *the* church, while they are way down below us somewhere, mere "denominations."

This notion that all others are denominations beside ourselves is a curious hangup. How can we really expect the Christian world to take us seriously when we make such claims? We have Church of Christ papers, Church of Christ colleges, Church of Christ preachers, Church of Christ publishing houses, Church of Christ orphanages, and even Church of Christ church builders, who finance "only for Churches of Christ" as per their ads. But still we are not a denomination, when, by definition, a denomination is that which has its own special name of identity!

In the same issue of the *Guardian* there were 96 ads of churches, the "Where to Worship when Traveling" bit. I have noted carefully that every one of them—without a single exception—gives its name as "Church of Christ" if it's named at all. Ninety-three read "Church of Christ," while three give no name at all, only the address.

Well, there is no need to belabor the point. We all know that we have "our" name and we don't want anybody else horning in on it. And that includes those "Christian Church" folk up north who presume to call themselves "Church of Christ," which really fouls up our folk, for the only way they have of telling the difference is when they spot an organ over in the corner—then *bang!*, out the door they go like a shot out of a cannon, lest they be contaminated. Thomas Campbell, that genial Presbyterian who started this thing in this country, suggested that you identify "the Church of Christ upon earth" by its Christ-likeness. That's not bad, but why bother with a little thing like that when the matter can be solved by the presence or absence of a music box!

This "name" business is an interesting thing in our history. James O'Kelly, who walked out on Bishop Asbury and became a "Republican Methodist," finally decided on the name Christian, and he started the first "Christian Church" in the country. Through the influence of Rice Haggard, an O'Kelly follower, the Barton Stone churches took the same name. Thus came the slogan "Christians Only." Somewhere along the line we converted that saying and thus perverted the spirit that inspired it, for "the only Christians" is sectarian, When the Campbells came along they preferred Disciples. So, through most of last century our folk were known by *three* names: Christian Church, Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ. It is as sad as it is interesting to note that as the Movement divided, each group took unto itself one of these names, generally speaking. The Church of Christ (non-instrumental) is the only one of the three that insists only upon that name and does not use the other two. The Disciples are the only ones who still use, more or less, all three names.

But it was a little more difficult to tag our pioneers as a "denomination" since they had several names that they interchanged rather loosely. But when we, in the Churches of Christ, use that name doggedly and exclusively, it borders on the ridiculous for us to claim to be undenominational. It is game-playing. No one takes it seriously, including our own folk. It is something we are supposed to say now and again, and we keep on dividing the church at large into two parts, one very large and one very tiny—"the denominations" and "us", the true church! But we are maturing with the years. In a few decades our editors will not have to write articles like this, urging us to come down off of it and face facts.

The real issue in all this is not whether we are a denomination, for the facts make that clear enough, but whether we are *a sect. A* denomination accepts the fact that the church is divided and seeks to be a responsible part of it, recognizing other denominations as Christian also. But a sect arrogates to itself the claim of being the only true church, setting all others at naught. I want us to move from sectarian to denominational in our attitude—*then* we can get down to the business of sharing truth and making our contribution to the reformation of the church at large, along with others.

But back to the *Guardian* ad. Barclay, Hendriksen, Barnes, Clarke, Wescott, Bruce, Lenski, Henry, Lightfoot, Thomas, along with scores and scores of authors of the Interpreter's Bible, the Pulpit Commentary, and the New International Commentary are not honored as brothers by the *Guardian.* How can the *Guardian,* and all the rest of our folk who so commonly do this sort of thing, make such a judgment? How can we walk into a seminary library and move along the stacks judging who is our Christian brother and who isn't? No wonder some folk see us as a narrow little Tennessee-Texas sect! We don't *have* to be this way.

There are signs of progress, however, so I want this piece to encourage you and not discourage you. The *Guardian* has a rather wide view of brotherhood after all, at least for the *Guardian.* One commentary is by a premillennialist (Milligan). One believed in societies (McGarvey). One is now a "liberal" (Foy Wallace, believe it!). One believed there are Christians in the sects and that Baptists were his brothers (Campbell). *Both* sides of the "college" question is represented (Zerr and Woods). Even a renegade "conservative" made the list (Fudge). So did numerous Christian Church writers (Restoration Library), which is confusing since these fellows are usually "denominational" and not brethren. This is surely fellowship of sorts, so we should count our blessings.

Anyway, I'm encouraged more than discouraged. The "middle wall of partition" may still run through the *Guardian* and other such places, but it appears to be a little lower than before, so that "brothers" and "brothers in error" can scamper back and forth in such a way that it is hard to tell the difference between them. And even "denominational" Christians are getting in through the back door, scores of them, and out through the front, all packaged up and posted, ready for "the brethren" to read. It just shows that "false teachers" have something to say to the faithful Christians after all!

I conclude by expressing my appreciation for the new image the *Guardian* has projected under its new owner, Theron N. Bohannan, and its new editor, James W. Adams. It is a handsome, well-edited journal. In this same issue there is a thoughtful piece on the degrees of sin by Vaughn Shofner, and the eulogy to the late Luther Blackmon by the editor is a tender and moving tribute. It is published twice each month at 7.00 for the year. The address is Box 1586, Lufkin, Texas 75901. *—the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Pilgrimage of Joy . . .

MISSION MESSENGER BEGINS

W. Carl Ketcherside

I am sure we made a lot of mistakes in the work in Saint Louis. Many of these were the result of attitudes. I can see now that we were quite exclusivistic, the first symptom of the sectarian spirit. It is probable that we could not have done too much to promote unity of the brethren at the time because the

climate was not right. Bridges must be built from both sides of the stream. Our approach to unity was quite simple. If everyone else gave up what they thought and joined in with us we would be together. There was no other way because we were the Lord's people. Our way was "the way that is right and cannot be wrong." We were no different in this respect than other factions in the area. All of us thought that our group was the one which heaven had established and all recognized the others as apostates and teachers of heresy.

There was a constant open season on proselytizing. We rejoiced when one from another group "learned the way of truth more perfectly" and took his stand with us on "the old Jerusalem gospel", as we liked to think of our puerile system of traditions and opinions. We were all agreed upon one thing, even if we could not agree upon anything else. Instrumental music had originated with the family of Cain, was perpetuated by Satan, and was the sign and seal of spiritual departure and degradation. The Christian Churches had sold themselves to sin and when one of their members came around us we "Mistered" him while we reluctantly "Brothered" all who opposed the instruments even if we had to do it with our fingers crossed because they were "brothers in error."

It is obvious now that we had little real consciousness of a vital personal relationship with the Lord. We were all affiliated with an institution whose chief men were skilled in legalistic nit-picking and who could "make out a case" for our procedural policy. Righteousness was not so much right standing with the Lord of glory, but standing right on the issues in which we gloried. We were very negative in our attitude toward the Holy Spirit and sought to confine him not so much to a compilation of printed pages, which would have been bad enough, but to our own understanding and interpretation, which was worse. This meant that if the Spirit did not work within the limits in which we worked and to which we assigned him, it was not the Holy Spirit at work at all, but Satan.

Not everything was bad, and we inaugurated some life-touching experiences. Perhaps the period from 1942 to 1947 constituted one of the busiest five years of my whole life. During that time the brethren started the third congregation. Taking about three dozen folk from Manchester Avenue who lived in the vicinity of Webster Groves, they planted them in a decrepit structure purchased from a defunct Pentecostal group. Emery Smith, who had moved to the city from Salem, Missouri, agreed to look after this group of humble people, and from the start they had "a mind to work." Brother Smith, who supported himself by hard manual toil at Missouri Bitumen Corporation, spent his spare time training, counselling and strengthening the saints. Because of their relative poverty the congregation at Manchester Avenue supplemented their contributions so they could meet their financial obligations.

Members of the other congregations went from work each evening to labor on the building. The sisters brought the evening meal and served it and there was a thirty minute prayer and praise service every evening while eating the "love snack", after which all returned to the task to continue until midnight. We grew as a spiritual temple even as the material building became more habitable. On December 18, 1946, the brethren at Manchester Avenue met to discuss the planting of the fourth

congregation, and to pray for God to open up an effectual door for the fulfillment of their plans. It is interesting to recall that I was not even in the city when any of the congregations were started. All of them were started by the elders who told me about it when I returned from work elsewhere.

I developed a series of tracts to use in sowing the seed. We took advantage of the latest printing techniques, employing modern typefaces and illustrative material. We used these in "saturation bombing", marking out areas of the city in which we covered every house. Brethren carried a supply with them, distributing them at work, passing them out on streetcars and buses, putting them in letters to friends and using them wherever

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

DOWN HOME

Final statistics on the North American Christian Convention which it was my privilege to attend in Cincinnati, showed there were more than 25,000 in attendance, with an excellent turn-out for workshops and forums which covered many vital areas of thought ... I returned home to assist in a Vacation Bible Study with the little group of saints meeting in Webster Groves, Missouri. The attendance reached 91 and it was a glorious season of fellowship in the Lord . . . The celebration of twenty years of freedom by the brethren who meet at Random Road Chapel in Arkansas City, Kansas, July 27-30 was a marvelous experience. I was especially thrilled that I could be there with Leroy and Ouida as well as many other fervent brothers and sisters, including my brother Paul and his wife. Under the guidance of Dr. Max Foster, the congregation ignored false tests of fellowship and walls of hostility and reached across lines to bring in those who had a message of love and unity. I spoke once and taught two lessons from Ephesians . . . August 9-11 I was in Winston Salem, North Carolina for the Southern Christian Youth Convention held in the lovely Convention Center in the heart of the city. There were some 1600 high school young people present and it was a real blessing to me to speak to them. Five were immersed one midnight in the swimming pool of the great Hyatt House Hotel, and one was restored to a greater sense of duty . . . As a part of its outreach program in the Saint Louis area, the saints at Oak Hill Chapel shared in a meeting at Webster Groves in which Teddie Renollet and I joined in the proclamation of the Word. The interest was good . . . Nell and I are sending free to any college or university student a copy of my book *One in Christ.* The request must be made personally and inform us of the name of the school where enrolled. The supply is limited and we advise you to write at once if you are interested. The address will be found at the close of this column . . . My complete series of lectures on the Revelation letter can be secured in cassette form from T. N. Ratliff, 9729 Calumet Drive, Saint Louis, Missouri 63137. Write to him and enclose a stamp and he will send you a complete list . . . For a list of cassettes containing some 200 of my lectures, including special forums on the

charismatic movement, send a large self-addressed stamped envelope to Vernon H. Woods, 2413 Dale Avenue, Eugene, Oregon 97401 . . . My latest book *Talks to Jews and Non-Jews is* available for $4.95 from either *Restoration Review* or from our address . . . I will be speaking at the Prairie Young Peoples Conference in Calgary, Alberta, Canada October 21-23 . . . November 9-11 will find me at Colonial Place Church of Christ, Hampton, Virginia in a seminar on The Church, The Home and The Family . . . November 15 I will be the speaker at the annual Pre-Thanksgiving Meeting at Alton, Illinois, with the Franor Avenue congregation . . . November 18, 19 I will be addressing the Indiana State Christian Youth Convention in Indianapolis . . . December 2 I will be addressing a meeting of The Master's Men at Elkhart, Indiana, and December 15 a men's Fellowship meeting at Salem, Illinois . . . On December 13 I am to speak again to the Jews at the Messianic Forum in Saint Louis . . . I will be at Kentucky Christian College, Grayson, Kentucky, January 25-27. — *W. Carl Ketcherside, 139 Signal Hill Drive, Saint Louis, Missouri 63121*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

READER'S EXCHANGE

Pat wants you to know that he really appreciates your expression of love and encouragement, and he sends you and his brothers and sisters in the Church of Christ his love. He has a special place in his heart for you all. —*Janet Fix, Pat Boone's secretary,* 9255 *Sunset Blvd., Los Angeles, CA* 90069

Like my son, Bill Watkins, Sweet Home, Or., and our Dayton friends, the Dennis Bairds, we grab our copy from the mail and devour it immediately while everything else waits. God is blessing your efforts in ways you'll probably never realize this side of heaven. To Him be the glory—Right? —*Hal and Betty Watkins, Dayton, WA.*

(Right! —Ed.)

Your down home, informal tone is appealing to me, and I believe it finds emotional response in numbers of people who I hope will continue in the faith. — *Harold Sims, Tokyo, Japan*

It is so nice to learn that I am not the only one that thinks "different." Keep up the good work. — *Rheba Brady, Montgomery, AL.*

I see more and more brethren shed-ding their party garments and accepting the freedom that Jesus offers. The cry for freedom is beginning to reverberate throughout Churches of Christ. This is not wishful thinking. I'm convinced of it. The grassroots are tiring of the burden of party dictates and are longing for the rest of the Savior. — *John Trotter, University of Georgia*

I began subscribing to your journal earlier this year, and just recently purchased the bound volume for 1975-76. This reading has made me more aware of the fact that the positions and attitudes of "churches of Christ" today are in many instances a far cry from our restoration heritage. It whets my appetite to dig into our restoration literature. — *Dan Robers, Locust Grove, OK.*

We are planning a new fellowship of Christians that will be knit together in love. Believing in the essential unity of Christ's body and that division is a horrid evil, we welcome the fellowship of all faithful immersed believers who follow Christ. We plan to imitate the early church as closely as possible. We are anxious to receive inquiries from interested people. — *Phillip Kight, 200 S. Glenn Dr., 44-F, Camarillo, CA 93010.*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

OFFICE NOTES

A number of our readers are pleased to have the Six *Version New Testament,* which has the six most popular versions lined up side by side across the page, and it is a durable, beautiful book. We can supply it for 12.95.

The 2-volume set of *Millennial Harbinger* by Alexander Campbell continues to be a popular item, despite the fact that the 41 volume unabridged set is now available, for it contains cream of the larger set and is only 12.95.

We can now send you a fistful of Carl Ketcherside's latest stuff: *Talks to Jews and Non-Jews (5:25); The Twisted Scriptures (3.25); The Death of the Custodian (3.20); Heaven Help Us* (The Holy Spirit in Your Life), also 3.20. Postage included.

For 3.20 we will send you *The Way It Was in Bible Times,* M. T. Gilbertson, which opens up the scriptures by explaining many of the old customs.

At my insistence Ouida is now reading *John Bunyan: The Tinker of Bedford.* We both say it is one of the most absorbing books we've ever read. 3.20.

"Sex is morally appropriate only for people who intend the total life-union that the act signifies," is but one of many wise judgments in *Sex for Christians* by Lewis Smedes, who teaches at Fuller Seminary. He takes up all the problems, in and out of marriage. 3.20.

For a special price of 4.95 (because we have them on hand and they're literally wrapped in cellophane) we will send you a beautiful, colorful *Children s Living Bible.* Lots of illustrations. Boxed for a gift. Ideal for that grandchild!

This volume will be bound into a book at the close of this year under title of *Principles of Unity and Fellowship.* We will bind only twice the number we have advanced sales for, so you should reserve a copy at once if you want to be sure of getting one. It will match all our previous bound volumes. If you reserved a copy when you paid for the last one, you need not do any more, for your copy of the new one will be sent to you with invoice enclosed. But *we urge you*, reserve your copy for the new bound volume at once, if you want one.

We are pleased that we can still send this journal to you at only 3.50 per year when you subscribe for two years at a time. For 200 or more pages for the year that is a bargain these days. When you send it to at least four others beside yourself, the price is only 2.00 per name per year. We hope you'll take advantage of this inexpensive way of exposing other interested people to what we are saying.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, TX 76201*

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly, except July and August, at 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas, on a second class permit. SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $3.00 a year, or two years for $5.00; in clubs of five or more (mailed by us to separate addresses) $ 1.50 per name per year.